DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 391 FL 016 789

AUTHOR Steever, Sanford B.
TITLE Exceptions to Case-Marking and the Grammar of Complementation in Dravidian.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the South Asian Languages Analysis Roundtable (8th, Urbana, IL, May 29-31, 1986)
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case (Grammar); Diachronic Linguistics; *Dravidian Languages; *Language Patterns; Lexicology; *Linguistic Theory; Morphemes; *Morphology (Languages); *Sentence Structure; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Syntax; Uncommonly Taught Languages; *Verbs

ABSTRACT

The morphological and lexical bases of Dravidian complementation are explored by proposing a series of rules that govern the distribution of finite predicates in the Dravidian sentence. The distribution of two verbs, "a-" ("become") and "en-" ("say"), is shown to be correlated with the distribution of finite predicates. These predicates are negative absolute exceptions to case-marking. Certain syntactic changes in North Dravidian are shown to be accomplished by increasing the number of predicates that are exceptions to case-marking, rather than by blindly imitating Indo-Aryan structures. The hypothesis of brute-force convergence is rejected as an explanation for these syntactic changes in favor of one that uses native lexical, morphological, and syntactic resources in diachronic syntax. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283391

Exceptions to Case-marking and the Grammar of Complementation in Dravidian

Sanford B. Steever

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Steever

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL 016 789

Paper presented at the South Asian Languages Analysis Roundtable (8th, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL May 29-31, 1986).

Studies in the Linguistic Sciences
Volume 17, Number 1, Spring 1987

REMARKS ON DRAVIDIAN COMPLEMENTATION*

Sanford B. Steever

The morphological and lexical bases of Dravidian complementation are explored by proposing a series of rules that govern the distribution of finite predicates in the Dravidian sentence. The distribution of two verbs, a- 'become' and en- 'say' is shown to be correlated with the distribution of finite predicates. They owe this to the fact that they are negative absolute exceptions to case-marking. Certain syntactic changes in North Dravidian are shown to be accomplished by increasing the number of predicates that are exceptions to case-marking, rather than by blindly imitating Indo-Aryan structures. The hypothesis of brute-force convergence is rejected as an explanation for these syntactic changes in favor of one that utilizes native lexical, morphological and syntactic resources in diachronic syntax.

0. Introduction. The commonplace observation that different languages may express the same grammatical concept in radically different ways is the foundation of many language typologies, the most celebrated of which is Sapir's. According to a somewhat less subtle typology, languages may be said to differ according as they encode certain grammatical concepts in morphology or syntax. Close to the center of Sapir's typology, the Dravidian languages rely extensively on their morphology and lexicon to carry out those grammatical tasks which more peripheral languages, such as Chinese or English would entrust to their syntax. This difference is illustrated here with the use of morphology and lexicon in the formation of complex sentences in the Dravidian languages. Attention is focused on the crucial roles played by two verbs which are exceptions to the rules of case-assignment in the construction of complex sentences.

Certain conventions, which are followed in this paper, are noted here. Dravidian etyma are numbered according to the system in A Dravidian etymological dictionary, 2nd edition, and are identified by the abbreviation DEDR. The following notations are used in the interlinear glosses of the examples: abl - ablative; acc - accusative; adnp - adnominal participle; cond - conditional; cp - conjunctive participle; dat - dative; f - feminine; fut - future; gen - genitive; h - honorific; imp - imperative; inf - infinitive; int - interrogative; loc - locative; m - masculine; n - neuter; neg - negative; nom - nominative; npst - nonpast; obl - oblique; perf -perfect; perm - permissive; pl -plural; pres - present; pst - past; s - singular; soc - sociative; vn - verbal noun; 1 - first person; 2 - second person; 3 - third person. Morpheme boundaries have been approximately inserted into the examples, so no systematic significance should be attached to their placement or their absence. The transcription of the Tamil examples follows that used in Steever (1986).

The Dravidian languages distinguish just two parts of speech according to their morphology (note 1): noun and verb, both of which may occur in simple or compound forms. Noun and verb are mutually implicating terms (note 2), and are so strongly polarized in opposition to each other that their bonding has effectively inhibited the growth of new morphological and syntactic categories (note 3). Nouns are typically inflected for case, a category that characterizes the relation of a noun to its predicate within the confines of a single clause (note 4). Verbs are inflected for verbal categories such as mood and tense. Unlike case, a verbal category can establish a grammatical relation outside the bounds of a single clause. Verbs prove to be the fundamental variable in the Dravidian sentence in virtue of the fact that they combine two roles. Not only do they encode valuble grammatical information in verbal categories, but they also govern the case-assignment of the nouns they combine with. Particular attention is therefore drawn to the central role of verbs in the formation of the Dravidian sentence.

This perfectly balanced and tightly knit system of verb and noun has a direct bearing on the construction of the complex sentence. The Dravidian languages lack those parts of speech that acquaintance with a standard average European language or an introductory textbook of generative linguistics would lead us to believe are indispensible elements of the complex sentence: conjunctions (and), complementizers (that) and adverbs (during). The grammatical functions traditionally associated with these parts of speech are assumed by the morphology of nouns and verbs in the Dravidian languages. And yet the basic opposition of noun and verb may be too strong, for the morphology can be shown to impose severe restrictions on the structure and variety of the Dravidian sentence. It stands to reason, then, that exceptions to the rules of morphology may well provide the grammatical means to circumvent these restrictions. Two Dravidian verbs, *a- 'become' (DEDR 333) and *en- 'say, think' (DEDR 868), are shown to be negative absolute exceptions to the principles of case-assignment. They may be used in this capacity to get around the morphological constraints on the structure of the complex sentence.

Section 1 discusses the basic structure of simple and complex sentences, concentrating especially on the distribution of finite predicates within these structures. A rule is proposed to describe the distribution of finite and nonfinite predicates in sentences of any internal complexity. Section 2 notes that this rule raises a number of syntactic and pragmatic problems in the formation of complex sentences. These problems are overcome with the use of two exceptions to case-assignment, viz., *a- 'become' and *en- 'say, think'. Section 3 then introduces other predicates which may on occasion enter this elite class of exceptions. A preliminary semantic classification of such predicates is formulated in light of these examples. Section 4 discusses the impact of this phenomenon on the syntactic development of the Dravidian languages, particularly the northern subgroup. The possibility of reconstructing this phenomenon for Proto-Dravidian is discussed, and the hypothesis of areal convergence with Indo-Aryan debated.

1. Basic Dimensions of the Dravidian Sentence. First, a few words about Dravidian morphology are in order. It is transparent, agglutinating and predominantly suffixal. The order of morphemes in the word is: lexical root, derivational suffix and inflectional suffix. Noun and verb are morphologically distinguished according to the grammatical categories they inflectionally encode. The common Dravidian case system include eight cases: nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, locative, sociative, instrumental, and ablative (note 5). Nouns may be additionally marked for number and gender. Some languages, such as Gondi and old Tamil, can inflect predicate nominals for person, e.g., the suffix -ēm in the old Tamil predicate nominal pentir-ēm 'we women' marks agreement with a first person plural subject. Verbs mark verbal categories such as tense and mood. A verb is in formal terms finite or not, depending as it bears inflections for tense and subject-predicate agreement, or not. The finite verb appears at the end of the sentence, bringing it to a close. All other verbs in the sentence must appear in a nonfinite form: by definition, they combine with a following word, and so do not close the sentence. Nonfinite verbs come in two varieties. The first included all the forms that combine with a following noun to create relative clauses and other kinds of nominal complements. In traditional Tamil grammar they are known as peyareccam 'verbs that anticipate a noun', and include the adnominal (relative) participles. I deviate here from traditional usages in including verbal nouns under the heading of peyareccam, they differ from adnominal participle and head noun only in that the verbal noun morphologically incorporates the head along with the verb. The second includes all those verb forms that combine with a following verb. Known as viNaiyeccam in traditional terminology, they include such forms as the conjunctive participle, the infinitive and the conditional. It is important to remember that a nonfinite verb and the word it combines with may stand adjacent or be separated by intervening material, which criterion serves to distinguish them from mere compounds.

The simple sentence is a single clause consisting of a subject and a predicate. The subject is a noun-phrase that is inflected for the nominative or, in certain circumstances, the dative case. (Some sentences may in fact have locative subjects, e.g., Kannada nanna hattira hana ide 'near$_2$ me$_1$ money$_3$ is$_4$', i.e., 'I have money'; however, more research is needed to establish whether or not such 'locative subjects' do in fact have subject-coding properties, such as the ability to antecede a reflexive pronoun.) The predicate is either a finite verb or a predicate nominal. From the various combinations of subjects and predicates emerge four basic sentence types: (1) nominative subject and predicate nominal, (2) nominative subject and finite verb, (3) dative subject and predicate nominal, and (4) dative subject and finite verb. The four basic types are illustrated here with examples from Kannada and Konda.

(1) KANNADA

a	avaru	adhyāpakaru.
	he-h-nom	teacher-nom
	'He (is a) teacher.'	

b	avaru	ba-nd-aru.
	he-h-nom	come-pst-3h
	'He came.'	

(1) KANNADA

c avar-ige obba maga.
he-h-dat one-m son-nom
'He has a son.'

d avar-ige tamiḷu bar-at-te.
he-h-dat Tamil-nom come-pres-3sn
'He knows Tamil.'

(2) KONDA

a māp sēna dūramti lōku.
we-nom very distance-abl people-nom 'We are people from far away.'

b bānzaraza suṛ-t-an.
barren king-nom see-pst-3sm
'The barren king saw.'

c aya guruy-eŋ budi.
that guru-dat wisdom-nom
'That guru has wisdom.'

d lok-aŋ kōpam va-n-ad.
man-dat anger-nom come-npst-3sn
'That man gets angry.'

Inspection of the grammars of sister languages reveals just how widespread and basic these four sentence patterns are.

The COMPLEX sentence consists of one main clause at the extreme right boundary of the sentence, and one or more dependent clauses preceding it. Only the predicate in the main clause is finite: it occurs rightmost in the constituent structure, commands all other predicates and is itself commanded by none. The predicate in each dependent clause is a nonfinite verb, either a peyareccam or viNaiyeccam, according to the demands of the particular structure. Examples from Tamil and Konda are used below to illustrate a variety of complex sentences, and the important role that nonfinite verbs play in their formation.

(3) TAMIL

a mazai pey-tu veyil aṭi-ttu vāNavil tōNR-iy-atu.
rain-nom rain-cp sun-nom beat-cp rainbow-nom appear-pst-3sn
'It rained, the sun beat down and a rainbow appeared.'

b teyvattiN aruḷ kiṭai-kkak kaviñar uṇarcciyuṭaN pāṭ-iN-ār.
god-gen grace get-inf poet-nom feeling-soc sing-pst-3h
'The poet sang with emotion to obtain God's grace,' or
'The poet, having obtained God's grace, sang with emotion.'

c makaN poy coNN-āl appa aṭi-pp-ār.
son-nom lie tell-cond father-nom beat-fut-3h
'If the son lies, his father will beat him.'

d nāN mantiri va-nt-a ceyti keṭ-ṭ-ēN.
I-nom minister-nom come-pst-adnp news hear-pst-1s
'I heard the news that the minister had come.'

e mantiri va-nt-at-ai avaN pār-tt-āN.
minister-nom come-pst-vn-acc he-nom see-pst-3sm
'He saw that the minister had come.'

(4) KONDA

a or nēnd vāz-i darman kiʔa.
one day come-cp help do-imp
'Come one day and help us.'

b anasi uṇ-de bas-t-an.
brother-nom eat-inf sit-pst-3sm
'The elder brother sat down to eat.'

c embe sur-t-iŋa nāru sil-ed.
where look-cond town-nom not be-pst-3n
'Wherever they looked, there was no town.'

d rū-n-i guid-ed so-R-ad.
plough-npst-adnp field-loc go-pst-3sn
'She went to the field that they plough.'

e aya bodel sur-t-ika idʔed.
that woman-nom see-pst-vn leave-neg-pst-3sn
'That woman did not leave alone what she saw.'

Use of the conjunctive participle is illustrated in (3a) and (4a); the infinitive in (3b) and (4b); the conditional in (3c) and (4c); the adnominal participle in (3d) and (4d); and in (3e) and (4e) the verbal noun, which fuses an adnominal participle with a pronominal head.

The distribution of finite and nonfinite predicates in the Dravidian sentence leads us to state Rule A below, a first approximation to the rule that governs the occurrence of finite and nonfinite predicates.

RULE A - THE DISTRIBUTION OF FINITE PREDICATES

i. Each Dravidian sentence has exactly one finite predicate.

ii. The lone finite predicate occurs rightmost in the surface constituent structure, commands all other predicates and is itself commanded by none.

iii. All other predicates are nonfinite.

Inspection of example (3a) bears out the predictions of Rule A: the single finite verb, toNRiyatu 'it appeared', occurs in the rightmost clause in the surface constituent structure. The two remaining predicates, peytu 'raining' and atittu 'beating', are both conjunctive participles, which are nonfinite verb forms. Note that Rule A does not distinguish between finite verbs and predicate nominals: both are treated equally as finite predicates. Their distribution is identical: predicate nominals occur only where finite verbs occur, and vice versa. In essence, Rule A defines finiteness as a syntactic property; for only those predicates are considered finite which occur in the specially designated position identified in the second clause of Rule A. Finiteness is subsequently interpreted in morphological terms, according to the lexical class of the predicate. If the finite predicate is a verb, it must be marked for tense and subject-predicate agreement (note 6). If, on the other hand, it is a noun, it must be marked for the nominative case and, in some languages, for subject-predicate agreement.

Nouns can never have nonfinite forms according the rule above. Hence, predicate nominals can never appear in dependent clauses. The third clause of Rule A properly applies only to nonfinite verb forms. This asymmetry between nouns and verbs gives rise to some problems, as we shall see below.

2. Multiple Finte Predicates in the Dravidian Sentence. Despite the ingenuity with which nonfinite verbs are used to construct complex sentences, a number of syntactic and pragmatic dilemmas quickly surface. Rule A assigns just one finite predicate to each sentence, no matter how internally complex it might be. This creates numerical and structural asymmetries in the distribution of finite and nonfinite predicates. Each sentence has just one finite predicate, but may have indefinitely many nonfinite predicates. The former appears only in main clauses, the latter only in dependent clauses. Another disparity emerges in the distribution of predicates. Predicate nominals have only finite forms; so, according to Rule A, they may never appear in a dependent clause. It follows from this restriction that only one-half of the basic clause-types, noted above, may appear in a dependent clause: those with a predicate nominal are entirely barred.

The syntactic restrictions imposed by Rule A lead to a particularly thorny pragmatic constraint. The grammar of complex sentences, as expressed in this rule, provides no means of forming direct discourse. Speaker A cannot report what speaker B said, without first transforming the finite predicate in speaker B's speech into a nonfinite form, embedded under a verb of reporting in speaker A's speech.

(5) TAMIL

a nī vā.
you-nom come-imp
'You come!'

b avaN eNNai varac cōNNāN.
he-nom I-acc come-inf tell-pst-3sm
'He told me to come.'

Thus, the finite imperative verb-form vā 'come!' in (5a) must be transformed into the nonfinite infinitive vara 'to come', because the verb of reporting, cōNNāN 'he told', is the only verb that Rule A will designate as a finite predicate. By the same token, it would be virtually impossible to embed a predicate nominal under a predicate of reporting. This consequence of Rule A goes against the general belief that direct discourse is both less marked and more common than indirect discourse.

To solve these and related problems, two verbs are introduced here whose exceptional behavior allows them to circumvent in a clever, yet principled way the constraints that Rule A imposes on the formation of complex sentences in constraining the distribution of finite predicates. They are *ā- 'become' and *en- 'say, think'. They share a common property, one that is virtually unique among the verbs of the Dravidian languages. They may take as their direct objects expressions of any syntactic category and internal complexity. Furthermore, they do not impose on these objects any morphological indication of their objecthood. They may take as their objects interjections, single words, phrases, sentences, or whole chunks of discourse; they may combine with nouns and verbs with equal facility. They do not require their direct objects to undergo any morphological adjustment, such as assuming a nonfinite verb-form or bearing a case-marker. And, in fact, they cannot do so. They are, in Lakoff's terms, negative absolute exceptions to case-assignment.

In as much as the theory of case-assignment, and not the theory of finiteness, is responsible for the morphological interpretation of direct objects, the verbs *ā- 'become' and *en- 'say, think' effectively shield their direct objects from the jurisdiction of Rule A. On the other hand, since these two verbs are negative absolute exceptions to case-assignment, they need not subcategorize objects that are subject to case-assignment, viz., nouns. This frees them to combine with expressions of any syntactic category and any morphological shape. What is most relevant for our purposes, however, is that they may combine with a finite predicate.

The secret of their success in overcoming the constraints imposed by Rule A derives not just from their morphological exceptionality, but also from the fact that they are morphologically verbs. As such, they enjoy all the formal and morphological privileges of that class. When they are inflected as verbs, they may be embedded along with their direct objects in a larger syntactic pattern, according to the variety of complex sentences discussed above in Section 1. Although the inflected forms of these two verbs often appear to behave like complementizers and conjunctions, they formally belong to the class of verbs. And it is only on this assumption that we can appeal both to their exceptionality regarding case-assignment and to their ability to combine with nonfinite forms so as to explain how they can embed a finite predicate in a dependent clause, and thus overcome the constraint against multiple finite predicates in the sentence.

The following examples demonstrate the various uses to which reflexes of *en- 'say, think' are put in the formation of complex sentences with multiple finite predicates.

(6) TAMIL

a nāN avaN nallavaN eN-Ru niNai-kkiR-ēN.
I-nom he-nom good man-nom say-cp think-pres-1s
'I think that he is a good man.'

b atai uṭai-tt-ay eN-Rāl uNNaic cummāka viṭamāṭṭēN.
it-acc break-pst-2s say-cond you-acc alone leave-fut-neg-1s
'If you broke it, I won't leave you alone.'

c avaN cettuppōNāN eN-kiR-a ceyti kēṭ-ṭ-ēN.
he-nom die-pst-3sm say-pres-adnp news hear-pst-1s
'I heard the news that he had died.'

d avaN iṅkē va-nt-ān eN-patu uṇmai tāN.
he-nom here come-pst-3sm say-vn-nom truth-nom indeed
'It is indeed true that he came here.'

(7) KANNADA

a nannannu nanna pādige biṭṭu-bidi endalu jānaki.
I-acc I-gen place-dat leave-imp say-pst-3sf Janaki-nom
'Janaki said, "Leave me alone."'

b emṭīārinalli dōse tinōna an-ta mane biṭṭu hora-ṭ-a.
MTR-loc dosai eat-ñort say-cp house leave-cp start-pst-3sm
'He went out in order to eat dosai at the MTR.'

(8) KONDA

a mā buba rey-n-a i-R-an.
my father-nom beat-npst-1s say-pst-3sm
'My father said, "I will beat you."'

b u-n-a i-Riŋa anam sil-ed.
eat-npst-1s say-cond food-nom not be-pst-3sn
'There was no food to eat," lit., "There was no food, if you say "I want to eat."'

(9) KUVI

a ēvasi nehasi inj-ihi ṉānu nam-i-ʔi.
he-nom good man-nom say-cp I-nom believe-npst-1s
'I believe that he is a good man.'

b ē samomita ro mosali ānataki tir-vi man-j-i
that time-loc one crocodile-nom wht wander-cp be-pst-2s
inj-ihi burhaʔa vec-c-e.
say-cp old man-acc ask-pst-3sn
'Then the crocodile asked the old man, "Why were you wandering?"

(10) KOLAMI

a ān sā-t-un en-a ar-t-an.
I-nom go-impf-1s say-cp cry-pst-1s
'I cried because (lit., saying) I was going away.'

b amd anu vā en-a iṭ-t-an.
he-nom I-dat come-imp say-cp tell-pst-3sm
'He told me to come.'

(11) OLLARI

a raytul tre tre in-ji sindup-eṭi sāy-d-ar.
farmer-nom tre tre-onom say-cp call-cp be-fut-3sm
'The farmer would call out, "Tre tre" (to the sheep).'

b endrika boŋga ke-n-ed in-ji adin pakkan
crabs-nom holes-acc do-pst-3pn say-cp it-gen side
bokka kē-d-aṇ.
hole-acc do-npst-3sm
'Claiming that crabs dug the holes (in his neighbor's tank bund), he will dig a hole in its side.'

Reflexes of *en- 'say, think' embed predicate nominals in (6a) and (9a); ordinary finite verbs in (6b), (6c), (8a), (8b), (9b), (10a), and (11b); speech-act verb-forms in (7a), (7b) and (10b); and onomatopoeia in (11a). The verb *en- may itself appear in a number of different forms: as a finite verb in (7a) and (8a); as a conditional in (6b) and (8b); as a verbal noun in (6d); as an adnominal participle in (6c); and as a conjunctive participle in the other examples. The verb has its full lexical meaning in (7a), (8a) and (11b); and, in these examples, may be said to be "base-generated." In the other examples, however, it seems not to contribute a lexical meaning to the meaning of the whole sentence; accordingly, it may be considered to be "transformationally inserted." Despite the individual differences to be found among these sentences, all share the common property of embedding a finite predicate under the verb *en-.

Reflexes of the common Dravidian verb *ā- 'become' are also used to serve the same kinds of syntactic functions, as the set of examples overleaf demonstrates.

(12) TAMIL

cāmāN vāṅka veṇṭum āN-āl vāṅku all-atu
goods buy-inf want-fut-3sn become-cond buy-imp become-neg-vn
kaṭaiyai viṭ-ṭu iRaṅku.
store-acc leave-cp get down-imp
'Unless you are going to buy the goods you want to buy, leave the store.'

(13) KANNADA

yāru avana edurige āduttiralilla ād-ar-ū
no one-nom he-obl against speak-pst perf-neg become-cond-and
heṅgsara mūlaka ī mātu kāvēriya kivi muṭṭuttittu.
women-gen through this word K.-gen ear reach-pst perf-3sn
'Though no one has spoken directly to him about this matter, word reached Kaveri's ear through women's gossip.'

(14) PENGO

hī-d-n-ay ac-i hī-d-a.
give-tp-fut-2s become-cp give-tp-imp
'If you are going to give it to me, give it.'

(15) PAṚJI

īn nāto andar pat-t-o-mẽ-d-a ag-i
you-obl what confusion-nom befall-pres prf-3sn become-cp
īn bulkak-mo-t.
you-nom err-pres-2s
'What is confusing you that you should make such a mistake?'

These four examples suffice to show us that reflexes of the verb *ā- 'become' can be used to embed finite predicates. In (12) the conditional form āNāl 'if become' embeds the finite predicate vēntum 'be wanted', while the negative verbal noun allatu 'that which does not become', based on al- 'not become' the negative stem variant of *ā- 'become', embeds the finite imperative verb vāṅku 'buy!' Further examples can easily be found in the relevant grammars and texts.

These examples necessitate a revision of Rule A to accommodate the sentences above with multiple finite predicates. The number and position of finite predicates in the Dravidian sentence vary directly with the number and position of instances of these two verbs in their capacity as complementizers. They are called FINITE PREDICATE EMBEDDERS, or FPEs for short.

RULE B - THE DISTRIBUTION OF FINITE PREDICATES, REVISION

i. The Dravidian sentence has exactly n+1 finite predicates, where n equals the number of FPES and 1 represents the finite predicate in the main clause.

ii. The finite predicate in the main clause occurs highest and rightmost in the constituent structure, commands all other predicates and is itself commanded by none. Each FPE embeds a finite predicate in a dependent clause. The finite predicate associated with a FPE occurs highest and rightmost in the sentence commanded by the FPE, commands all other predicates in that sentence and is itself commanded by none.

iii. All other predicates are nonfinite.

This rule accurately describes the distribution of finite predicates in the Dravidian sentence. Using the various forms of *ā- 'become' and *en- 'say, think', a sentence can embed all of the four basic sentence types, and form direct discourse. Thus, verbs that are negative absolute exceptions to the principles of case-marking can take finite predicates as their direct objects and embed them in a dependent clause (note 7).

3. Further Exceptions to Case-Assignment. Rule B explicitly states what Dravidian linguists have tacitly understood for a long time. What has not been as clearly recognized heretofore is that many other predicates may on occasion enter the elite class of FPEs. Although the identity of these lexemes varies from one language to the next, the following examples indicate that they are largely drawn from predicates of perception, cognition, communication, and comparison. Note also that both nouns and verbs can serve as FPEs.

(16) TAMIL

a nī eNNa cen-cu iru-kka-ṇum teriyum-ā?
you-nom what do-cp be-inf-must know-fut-3sn-int
'Do you know what you must do?'

b anta āḷu rompa nallavaN mātiri iru-kk-āN
that man-nom very good man-nom likeness be-pres-3sm
pār-tt-iy-ā?
see-pst-2s-int
'Did you understand how good that man is?'

c . . . moy-tt-a tumpi paṛam cettu . . . (naRRiṇai 35.3)
swarm-pst-adnp bee-nom fruit-nom think like-cp
'Mistaking the swarming bees for a fruit . . .'

(17) TODA

i mox i· xɨs-s-k nwɨ·ṭ-k-in.
this boy-nom what do-pst-3s see-fut-1s
'I will see what this boy did.'

(18) KANNADA

a niṅge estu uṣṇa āgide gott-a?
you-dat how̱ heȧt-nom become-pres prf-3sn knowledge-nom-int
'Do you know how hot it has become?'

b nānu hēḷ-t-īni kēḷu.
I-nom tell-pres-1s hear-imp
'Listen to what I am saying.'

c pasarise tumbi-gaḷ kuvalayaṅgaḷ aral-du-ve
spreading bee-pl-nom water lily-pl-nom open-pres-3np
gettu . . . (pampa bhārata 5.63).
think like-cp
'Mistaking the swarming bees for a blossoming water lily . . .'

(19) TELUGU

a āyanuku kāsta dhairyam nīwu ceppali.
he-dat little courage-nom you-nom say-may
'You might say he has little courage.'

b cep-t-ānu vinu.
tell-fut-1s hear-imp
'Listen to what I am going to tell you.'

(20) KONDA

a embe so-R-a ma-n-an veR-si sī-d-a.
where go-pst-tpe be-npst-3sm tell-cp give-imp
'Tell me where he has gone.'

b nān unri māṭa veR-n-a ve-n-id-a?
I-nom one word tell-npst-1s hear-npst-2s-int
'Are you listening to what I am telling you?'

(21) PARJI

nāto rōn paṭ-ṭ-o-mẽ-d-a cūr-i ver.
which crying befall-pres prf-3sn see-cp come-imp
'See which woman is crying, and come (back).'

Observe that this set of examples includes FPEs that are morphologically nouns: mātiri 'likeness, manner' in (16b) and gottu 'knowledge' in (18a) are predicates that both embed finite predicates. They appear to have entered this class of FPEs on the strength of their semantic similarity with the verbs that more commonly migrate into this class. These occasional FPEs embed either predicate nominals, as in (16a), (16c), (18c), and (19a), or finite verbs, as in the remaining examples of this set. These FPEs may themselves appear in main or dependent clauses. Although the majority of these FPEs contribute their full lexical meaning to the sentences they appear in, and to that extent fall just short of functioning are pure complementizers (note 8), certain FPEs in the Havyaka dialect of Kannada (Shastri 1971) and the Ramnad dialect of Tamil (Annamalai 1969:210) have lost their lexical meanings and assumed the role of complementizer which forms of *en- 'say, think' formerly held.

(22) KANNADA (HAVYAKA DIALECT)

a idu yēn āscɔryɛ̄ hēl kēḷ-tu.
this-nom what wonder-nom say-cp ask-pst-3sn
'She asked, "What is this wonder?"'

b tanɪgū ɔst kodi hēl-i hēl-t-yu du.
self-dat-and some give-imp say-cp say-pst-3sn that-nom
'She said, "Give me some, too."'

c sɔtt hāg bid-kɔm-bitr ātu hēl-i
die-adnp like fall-rfl-leave-cp become-pst-3sn say-cp
hāgē mād-tu.
like do-pst-3sn
'She was lying down as though she were dead.'

(23) TAMIL (RAMNAD DIALECT)

avaN var-r-ɛN-Nu coll-i coN-N-aN.
he-nom come-pres-1s-prt say-cp say-pst-3sm
'He said he was coming.'

In both sets of examples, a verb of communication, hēḷ- 'say' in Havyaka Kannada and col- 'say' in Ramnad Tamil, has replaced the now obsolete forms of the verb *en- 'say', anta 'saying' in Kannada and eNRu 'saying' in Tamil (note 9), in its capacity as a complementizer of finite predicates. It must be borne in mind that the single most important syntactic property of Dravidian FPEs is not whether they have a lexical meaning, but whether they can take finite predicates as their direct objects. It is enough to show for now that such predicates may temporarily migrate into the class of

negative absolute exceptions to case-assignment, and so behave like *ā- 'become' and *en- 'say, think'. Since the temporary FPEs vary from language to language, their identity must be verified anew for each language.

The verb *ā- 'become' seems to be a metonym for all of the predicates of comparison that function as FPEs: old Tamil cettu 'think like', Tamil pōla 'resemble' and mātiri 'likeness', old Kannada gettu 'think like'. etc. The verb *en- 'say, think', on the other hand, is a metonym for all the predicates of perception, cognition and communication that can serve as FPEs: Tamil colla 'tell', pārkka 'look at', teriya 'be known', ceyti 'news'; Kannada hēlu 'say', kēḷu 'listen', nōḍu 'look at', gottu 'knowledge', nija 'truth, fact'; Telugu ceppu 'say', teḷusu 'be known', viṇu 'listen', nijam 'truth'; Pengo hūṛ- 'see'; Konda ven 'hear', veR 'tell'; Parji cūṛ- 'look at'; etc. Study of texts will almost certainly bring to light additional predicates that may on occasion pass into the set of FPEs. With the aid of these temporary FPEs, many putative cases of parataxis and asyndeton, which have been reported in the Dravidian languages, may be given a more satisfactory and systematic explanation.

There is no need to revise Rule B to accommodate these other examples. As long as the grammar of each language lists the FPEs it sanctions, this rule will continue accurately to describe the distribution of finite and nonfinite predicates in the Dravidian sentence. Since this system and this rule are so pervasive and engrained in the daughter languages, it is not too outlandish to reconstruct Rule B -- or something very like to -- for the Proto-Dravidian era. Both Rule B and the two verbs *ā- 'become' and *en- 'say, think', in their capacities as complementizers, seem to belong to the common Dravidian heritage.

4. Diffusion, Convergence and Syntactic Evolution. Up to this point, all mention of the North Dravidian languages has been studiously avoided. The syntactic patterns in this subgroup deviate markedly from those discussed in the earlier sections of this paper. Yet the phenomenon of temporary FPEs may be able to cast new light on one facet of the syntactic evolution of the northern subgroup. These languages seem to have developed new syntactic patterns by admitting into the set of FPEs virtually any predicate that subcategorizes a sentential complement. The influx of so many new members into this set would have cost it its exceptionality, which would have lead in turn to a fundamental reorganization of sentence structure around the dimension of finiteness. Consider the following Kurux examples.

(24) KURUX

a ās bar$^{?}$on bācas.
he-nom come-fut-1s say-pst-3sm
'He said, "I will come."'

b en asra nan-d-an enghae sanngias bar$^{?}$os.
I-nom desire do-pres-1s I-gen friend-nom come-fut-3s
'I hope that my friend will come.'

In both examples, the finite verb of the main clause combines directly with a dependent clause containing a finite verb, without the intervention of a

FPE acting as a complementizer. Note that example (24b) positions the dependent clause after the main clause in imitation of a common Indo-Ayran syntactic pattern. Yet, if the syntactic influence were exerted on North Dravidian from Indo-Aryan, the changes exploited the Dravidian device of conjunctive-participle postposing to do so (note 10). The loss of "complementizers" in this subgroup is not the result of the diffusion of syntactic patterns from one language family to another, but the result of carrying to its logical end the expansion of the class of FPEs until it has lost its status of exceptionality.

This instance of syntactic development in North Dravidian may be viewed as an argument against an overly simple theory of the diffusion of grammatical features. Even though this theory has some currency in South Asian linguistics, it has been formulated only at relatively superficial levels of linguistic structure, often with fragmentary data and cursory analysis. What Sapir (1921:205-6) says about diffusion bears repeating here:

> Attempts have sometimes been made to explain the distribution of these fundamental structural features by the theory of diffusion . . . An examination of such cases, however, invariably reveals the significant fact that they are but superficial additions on the morphological kernel of the language.

What is said here about morphological drift may be equally well said about syntactic development in Dravidian, not the least because these languages extensively utilize their morphology to encode grammatical relations. If Indo-Aryan has exerted an influence on the development of Dravidian syntax, it has done so at a remove. These changes have been mediated, however, by Dravidian grammatical processes operating on Dravidian grammatical structures. As the expansion of the set of FPEs shows, the actual developments have followed a course charted by Dravidian forms and rules.

This brief discussion shows us how ingeniously the Dravidian languages employ their morphological and lexical resources to create complex syntactic structures. Two sets of devices have figured prominently in the discussion. Nonfinite verbs are used widely to form dependent clauses, which are ultimately linked with the finite predicate in the main clause of the sentence. FPEs are used to embed finite predicates in dependent clauses. They owe their ability to do this to the fact that they are negative absolute exceptions to case-assignment, and so may combine with a direct object of any category without first having it undergo a morphological change to mark objecthood or subordination. Nonfinite verbs are less marked than FPEs: while all verbs may have nonfinite forms, not all verbs can readily be exceptions to the principles of case-assignment. The syntactic behavior of FPEs presupposes the syntactic behavior of ordinary verbs, as well . While neither morphology nor lexicon can shoulder the entire burden of accounting for syntactic concepts such as constituency and dependency, they nevetheless contribute significantly to the grammar of complex sentences in Dravidian.

Further research may well corroborate the initial observation that in the Dravidian languages morphology encodes grammatical relations that would be encoded by syntactic means in other languages. This study may help to bring into greater relief the principles that govern the interaction of morphology and syntax as a function of a language's typological character. Such principles would then contribute to the study of language typology and universals. It is perhaps not too much to expect that genetically unrelated, but typologically similar languages, such as Sinhala, would resort to devices similar to those found in Dravidian to construct complex sentences. The prerequisites for such a language appear to be a highly limited number of parts of speech, the significant use of finiteness in constituent structure, an elaborate morphology, and determination of case-assignment by the verb.

NOTES

* The author wishes to thank Bh. Krishnamurti, James Gair, Hans Hock, and S.N. Sridhar for their perceptive commends on earlier versions of this paper. Responsibility for all errors rests solely with the author.

1. See Steever (1986) for a discussion of the typological features of the Dravidian languages. Although individual grammars may enumerate many more parts of speech, they can generally be resolved into various combinations of nouns and verbs. So-called indeclinables may prove to be defective nouns or verbs, and assigned to one category or the other on a case-by-case basis. There is also a set of clitic particles, e.g., *-ō 'or, whether', which play an important role in the syntax of complex sentences (see also note 7). Clitics are more marked than free words because they presuppose the existence of the words to which they are cliticized, although the converse is not necessarily true.

2. The opposition of verb and noun constitutes the logically minimal system of parts of speech. No language can have only one part of speech, just lexical bases that are indifferently inflected as verbs or nouns. As Sapir (1921:119) suggests, the two must be defined in opposition to each other.

3. New categories, innovated from within or borrowed from outside Dravidian, are drawn into the orbit of either nouns or verbs. For example, the Sanskrit privative prefix a-, ava- is reanalyzed in Tamil as the noun avam 'emptiness, void, nullity', with the stem variants ava- and a-. See Steever 1986 for a fuller discussion.

4. Case is assumed to be different from, though correlated with, thematic role. Furthermore, the genitive case does not easily fit this heuristic characterization of case since in Dravidian it is adnominal. Case is commonly held to describe a relation between a noun and a verb, but the genitive relates two nouns. It might be characterized -- unsatisfactorily, I think -- as a case that relates one noun to a verb through the means of another noun.

Furthermore, this jury-rig definition applies more properly to the abstract, rather than the localistic, cases. The latter may be said more properly to relate a noun to a clause or sentence as a whole, rather than just to the verb.

5. The first four cases are considered to be abstract or nonlocalistic; the second four, to be concrete or localistic. The shape of the first four is relatively easy to reconstruct to the protolanguage; that of the second four is not. The concrete cases are often supplemented by and, ultimately replaced by, postpositions derived from independents nouns or verbs in nonfinite forms.

6. A language such as Malayāḷam lacks personal endings to mark subject-predicate agreement on verbs. Therefore, it morpohologically interprets the syntactic property of finiteness is a different way.

7. Besides nonfinite verb forms and FPEs belonging to the class of verbs, a number of postclitic particles are also used to form complex sentences. Clitics such as *-o 'whether, or', *e- 'even, and', Kannada -alla 'isn't it?', and Telugu gada 'isn't it?'. Included among these sentence types are dubitative, correlative and appositive constructions. For the purpose of describing the distribution of finite predicates in the Dravidian sentence, these clitics are to be treated on an equal footing with the FPEs in Rule B. No new category of finite predicate embedders needs to be devised; we need only to expand the set of FPEs to include these clitics. (See note 9, where the Tamil verb eN- 'say, think' becomes the postclitic particle -Nu 'ibid' without losing its status as a member of the set of FPEs.)

8. What is essential in these examples with reflexes of *en- 'say, think' is not whether they have a full lexical meaning; for in some cases they do, in others, they do not. What is germane is that they may combine with finite predicates, embedding them in dependent clauses. It must be borne in mind that the notion of complementizer, as it applied in Dravidian, is an epiphenomenal function, not a basic formal category realized in a particular part of speech.

9. The form -Nu is a clitic particle that is formed through the contraction of the conjunctive participle eN-Ru 'saying'. In the present example, it could be analyzed either as a clitic particle that embeds a finite predicate (note 7), or as a boundary marker that is syncategorematically introduced into the structure of a matrix-complement sentence.

10. Though example (24b) exhibits a word-order that is typical of modern Indo-Aryan, not Dravidian, it can be shown (Steever 1987) that such constructions developed from native Dravidian constructions with the help of a common rule that permits the postposing of certain dependent clauses rightward over the finite verb. Examples from Tamil and Kannada are shown overleaf, in which a dependent clause with a conjunctive participle is postposed rightward over the finite verb.

TAMIL

(a) avaN ōṭi va-nt-āN.
he-nom run-cp come-pst-3sm
'He came running.'

(a') avaN va-nt-āN ōṭi.
he-nom come-pst-3sm run-cp
'He came running.'

(b) avaN varu-kiR-ēN eN-Ru coN-N-āN.
he-nom come-pres-1s say-cp tell-pst-3sm
'He said he was coming.'

(b') avaN coN-N-āN varu-kiR-ēN eN-Ru.
he-nom tell-pst-3sm come-pres-1s say-cp
'He said he was coming.'

KANNADA

(c) avaḷu nagutta mātād-id-alu.
she-nom laugh-cp speak-pst-3sf
'She spoke with a laugh (lit., laughing).'

(c') avaḷu mātāḍi-id-aḷu nagutta.
she-nom speak-pst-3sf laugh-cp
'She spoke with a laugh.'

It is easy to see that the rule which is responsible for this alternation could be exploited in the production of the now dominant word-order found in the Kurux examples in (24).

See Hock (1982, 1984) for arguments in favor of linguistic convergence which are based on crosslinguistic influence mediated through the grammatical structures of the different languages. Although I do not necessarily agree with what is said about the historical development of the Dravidian languages in particular, the methodology is sound in that it insists on relating linguistic changes to linguistic structures, whatever the ultimate motivation for those changes may be.

REFERENCES

Annamalai, E. 1969. Adjectival clauses in Tamil. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.

Burrow, T. and M.B. Emeneau. 1984. A Dravidian etymological dictionary, second edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hock, H.H. 1982. The Sanskrit quotative: a historical and comparative study. In Studies in the Linguistic Sciences, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 39-85.

_____. 1984. (Pre-)Rig-Vedic convergence of Indo-Aryan with Dravidian? Another look at the evidence. In Studies in the Linguistic Sciences, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 89-108.

Lakoff, G. 1970. Irregularity in syntax. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

naRRinai nāNūRu. 1976. Tinevelly: South India Saiva Siddhanta Book Publishing Society.

pampa bharatamemba vikrāmarjuna vijaya. 1976. Mysore: Prasaranga.

Sapir, E. 1921. Language -- An introduction to the study of speech. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

Shastri, K.G. 1971. The Havyaka dialect of North Kannara. Dharwar: Karnatak University.

Steever, S. 1986. Tamil and the Dravidian languages. In B. Comrie (ed.), The world's major languages, pp. 725-46. London: Croom Helm Ltd.

_____. 1987. The serial verb formation in the Dravidian languages. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas.